



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,702	02/11/2002	Nikhil R. Taskar	02-03	4396

7590

08/21/2003

William L. Botjer
PO Box 478
Center Moriches, NY 11934

EXAMINER

SUNG, CHRISTINE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2878

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073,702

Applicant(s)

TASKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Christine Sung

Art Unit

2878

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Objections***

1. Claims 10-16 are objected to because of the following informalities: There are two claims that have been numbered claim 10. The first claim will be referred to as claim 10 throughout this action, and the second claim will be numbered claim 11. The subsequent claims will be referred to in the same fashion; claim 10 (claim 10), claim 10 (claim 11), claim 12 (claim 13), claim 13 (claim 14), claim 14 (claim 15), claim 15 (claim 16). Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim lacks a period at the end of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-7 and 9-10 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10, respectively of U.S. Patent No. 6,534,772. Although the conflicting claims are not

Art Unit: 2878

identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed subject matter in the 6,532,722 patent claims a nearly identical high resolution phosphor screen as the one claimed in this application.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,534,772 in view of LeBlans et al. (US Patent 6,045,722).

The limitations set forth in claim 1 have been claimed by Chhabra et al. (US Patent 6,534,772), however the reference does not state the specific type of phosphor, BaFBr:Eu+2. However, it is well known in the art that this type of phosphor can be used in various applications, such as a high-resolution radiation imaging storage phosphor screen. LeBlans et al. discloses that the phosphor material used in imaging can be made of BaFBr:Eu+2 (see column 2, lines 30-36). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the BaFBr:Eu+2 phosphor with the invention as disclosed by Chhabra et al., as it would only involve a matter of design choice as to which type of phosphor will be used in the invention as claimed by Chhabra et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claims 11-16, none of the prior art of record discloses using a plurality of microchannel plates releasably secured to a base substrate. Although many prior art references disclose a method of constructing microchannel plates, most employ the

Art Unit: 2878

method of etching the microchannels onto the substrate and thus are not releasable.

Further, the releasability of the substrates allows for exchanging microchannels, and thus cannot be anticipated.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. US Patent 5,493,169- this reference discloses microchannel plates with a phosphor for use in imaging.

b. US Patent- this reference discloses the elements of the disclosed invention but the filing date of the reference is after the filing date of the present application.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christine Sung whose telephone number is 703-305-0382. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 7-4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta can be reached on 703-308-4852. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-0956 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Application/Control Number 10/073,702

Page 5

Art Unit: 2878

CS

August 8, 2003



DAVID PORTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800